

Non-Commutative Space-Times, Black Hole, and Elementary Particle

Mu-In Park¹

Department of Physics, City College of the CUNY
New York, NY 10031

ABSTRACT

It is shown that *elementary black hole* can not be distinguished from an elementary particle in the non-commutative space-times (space/space and space/time) at the Planck scale. But, the non-commutative space-times can not be “directly” measured in the elementary black hole system. A *time – varying* non-commutative parameter $\theta(t)$ is suggested in accordance with the time-varying- G scenario. By identifying the elementary black hole with an elementary particle, the large hierarchy between the weak scale and Planck scale is naturally understood. For *large black hole*, the discrete spectrum of the horizon area is derived by identifying the black hole horizon with a non-commutative sphere.

Keywords: Non-Commutative Geometry, Black Holes.

7 Jan 2002

¹Electronic address: muinpark@yahoo.com

Recently, there have been notable studies on the non-commutative space-times in diverse aspects [1]. However, it seems still unclear whether this is just a hypothetical extension of the usual theory as the commutative space-times are generalized to the non-commutative space-times inspired by the string theory, or a new physical paradigm which governs the space-time quantum. Moreover, we don't even know how small the non-commutative parameter is.

In this paper, I show that how the non-commutative *space – times*² (space/space and space/time) can provide new insights on our physical world which is sometimes mysterious: If one identify the non-commutative space/space, space/time parameter $\sqrt{\theta}$ as the Planck length, the elementary black hole, which is smaller than the Planck scale, can not be distinguished from the elementary particle such as the elementary black hole may be identified as an elementary particle. But, it is found that the non-commutative space-times can not be “directly” measured in the elementary black hole system. A *time – varying* non-commutative parameter $\theta(t)$ is suggested in accordance with the time-varying G scenario. From the identification of the elementary black hole with the elementary particle, the large hierarchy between the weak scale and Planck scale is naturally understood. A plausible way of resolution for the instability problem is proposed within the non-commutative quantum mechanics. For the large black hole, which is larger than the Planck scale, the discrete spectrum of the horizon area may be naturally understood from a non-commutative sphere.

Elementary black hole: Let me start by considering an elementary black hole whose horizon radius r_+ is smaller than the Planck length l_{Planck}

$$l_{\text{Planck}} = \sqrt{\frac{G\hbar}{c^3}} \sim 10^{-33} \text{ cm.} \quad (1)$$

But since the black hole (with mass m) has a horizon, according to the general relativity, at

$$r_+ \sim l_{\text{Schwarzschild}}, \quad (2)$$

where $l_{\text{Schwarzschild}}$ is the radius of the Schwarzschild-black-hole horizon:

$$l_{\text{Schwarzschild}} = \frac{2Gm}{c^2}, \quad (3)$$

the condition of the elementary black hole becomes

$$l_{\text{Schwarzschild}} \leq l_{\text{Planck}} \quad (4)$$

²It has been well-known that the lowest Landau level has the non-commutative spatial coordinates [2]. More recently, it has been proposed that the Chern-Simons theory on the non-commutative *space* is an *effective* description of the fractional quantum Hall effect [3, 4].

and then one finds a condition for the mass for the elementary black hole

$$m \leq m_{NC} \quad (5)$$

with a critical mass

$$m_{NC} = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{c\hbar}{G}} \sim 10^{-5} \text{ g}, \quad (6)$$

which is (half) of the Planck mass.

Now, let me consider the elementary black hole on a two dimensional non-commutative quantum plane with the coordinates x_1, x_2 :

$$[x_1, x_2] = i\theta. \quad (7)$$

The non-commutativity parameter $\sqrt{\theta}$ defines a length scale in which the non-commutativity is relevant. On the other hand, it is well-known in the black hole physics that the Planck length is a natural length below which the usual continuous space and time may be broken down [5, 6]. I take this as a fundamental assumption in this paper. So, let me take $\sqrt{\theta} = l_{\text{Planck}}$ such as the commutation relation (7) implies that

$$\Delta x_1 \Delta x_2 \geq l_{\text{Planck}}^2/2. \quad (8)$$

But there is no restriction on the accuracy of the measurement for one coordinate at *one* time so far.

Then, let me consider a measurement process for the coordinates of the elementary black hole on the quantum plane. To this end, one first note that the genuine size of the black hole is the horizon size r_+ since the black hole horizon is a boundary of our observable world. So, if the elementary black hole had a best localized position *before* the measurement, then the position will be given *a priori* with an accuracy $\Delta x_i \sim l_{\text{Schwarzschild}}$. Now, if one measure one of the spatial coordinate say x_1 , but the other coordinate x_2 was kept intact such as $\Delta x_2 \sim l_{\text{Schwarzschild}}$, then the uncertainty relation (8) shows that the uncertainty on the measured coordinate x_1 becomes

$$\Delta x_1 \geq \frac{\theta}{2 \Delta x_2} \sim l_{\text{Compton}}, \quad (9)$$

where

$$l_{\text{Compton}} = \frac{\hbar}{2mc} \quad (10)$$

is (half of) the Compton length of the elementary black hole, i.e., one can not measure the coordinate of the elementary black hole with an uncertainty smaller than l_{Compton} .

This limit on the localization of the spatial coordinate is the same as it for the elementary particle which does not have substructure [7]. Furthermore, it seems that there is no way to distinguish those two objects fundamentally: From the mass condition (5) one obtains another condition,

$$l_{\text{Compton}} \geq l_{\text{Planck}} \quad (11)$$

such as one obtains eventually

$$l_{\text{Compton}} \geq l_{\text{Planck}} \geq l_{\text{Schwarzschild}}. \quad (12)$$

But according to (9), this inequality means that one can not localize the elementary black hole as much as one can measure its boundary ($l_{\text{Compton}} \geq l_{\text{Schwarzschild}}$), which is consistent with the concept of the elementary particle, and non-commutative space ($l_{\text{Compton}} \geq l_{\text{Planck}}$) such as *the non-commutative space is not measured directly*.

A remarkable point of my derivation is that I have not used any of the commutation relations for other dynamical variables, i.e., $[x_i, p_j]$, $[p_i, p_j]$ *explicitly*, which is contrast to the usual derivation in the quantum mechanics [7] where the commutation relation $[x_i, p_j] = i\hbar\delta_{ij}$ and c as a limit velocity³ are used. This fact implies that one may consider generalized commutation relations such as⁴

$$[x_i, p_j] = f_{ij}(\hbar, \theta), \quad (13)$$

$$[p_i, p_j] = g_{ij}(\theta) \quad (i = 1, 2). \quad (14)$$

The commutation relation (13) shall be the usual one $[x_i, p_j] = i\hbar$ when one use the current value of G as $6.67 \times 10^{-8} \text{ cm}^3\text{g}^{-1}\text{sec}^{-2}$ for consistency with the quantum mechanical derivation for the elementary particles such as the existence of an elementary black hole is not inconsistent with the existence of an elementary particle. But since my derivation is independent on the value of G , the additional contribution of G through $\sqrt{\theta} = l_{\text{Planck}}$ need not be always neglected: This may be important in the early universe with the *time – varying – G* scenario; furthermore, in this scenario the non-commutative parameter change as $\theta(t) \sim G(t)$ if $\hbar, c$ are the true universal constants.

Moreover, since the critical mass m_{NC} of (6) is large enough such as all known elementary particles can be included in this category, the derivation of (9) from the quantum theory around the black hole on the non-commutative space, which should be also understood as a quantum

³If one allow the “tachyon”, which does not have a complete interpretation yet though, this quantum mechanical derivation will be invalid [8].

⁴Operator forms of f_{ij} , g_{ij} will be strongly constrained by the Jacobi identities (see for example [9]). But, the status of the Jacobi identities on the non-commutative plane remains unclear.

gravity, is sensible also for the elementary particles if we identify the elementary black hole with an elementary particle. In other words, the hierarchy of the length scales between l_{Compton} and l_{Planck} is understood by considering the quantum gravity on non-commutative space for the elementary black hole (see Ref. [10] for other mechanism from small extra dimension); in particular, for the case of $W^\pm, Z$ bosons which satisfy the mass condition (5) [$m_{W,Z} \sim 10^{-22}$ g] well, the hierarchy is

$$\begin{aligned} l_{\text{Compton}} &\sim 10^{-16} \text{ cm}, \\ l_{\text{Planck}} &\sim 10^{-33} \text{ cm}, \\ l_{\text{Schwarzschild}} &\sim 10^{-50} \text{ cm} \end{aligned}$$

and this is explained essentially as

$$l_{\text{Compton}} \times l_{\text{Schwarzschild}} \sim l_{\text{Planck}}^2. \quad (15)$$

In other words, *the hierarchy is a result of the space/space non-commutativity at the Planck scale and the existence of the black hole horizon for the elementary particle*. Moreover, if one consider the time-varying θ according to the time-varying G scenario, *there may be no hierarchy in the early universe* (with $G \sim 10^{26} \text{ cm}^3 \text{g}^{-1} \text{sec}^{-2}$).

All the results that I have considered so far supports the identification of the elementary black hole with an elementary particle. Now, the questions, which might cause this identification to be inaccurate, are

1) Can't the elementary black hole be probed below l_{Compton} by any successive measurements contrast to an elementary particle ?

2) Is there the Hawking radiation which might cause the elementary black hole to be unstable contrast to the stable elementary particle ?

In order to consider the first question, one *needs* also to consider the space/time non-commutativity⁵

$$[t, x_i] = i\theta/c \quad (16)$$

in conformity with the quantum mechanics [7] on the limitation of the time measurement:

$$\Delta t \geq \frac{\theta}{2 \Delta x_i} \sim l_{\text{Compton}}/c \quad (17)$$

⁵This has been considered in the context of string theory [11] such as the natural non-commutativity scale $\sqrt{\theta}$ is the string length $l_s \sim \sqrt{2\pi\alpha'}$. But, in our context, this is considered as a generic property of particle theory.

[the elementary black hole is assumed also to have a best localised position such as $\Delta x_i \sim l_{\text{Compton}}$ a priori before the time measurement as in the measurement of coordinate]; in this case, the causality may not be applied below the Compton length l_{Compton} where the concept of time is fuzzy by the amount of $\Delta t \sim l_{\text{Compton}}/c$, the time it takes light to traverse the distance l_{Compton} [12]. This explains why the two orthogonal coordinates x_1, x_2 were not *simultaneously* measured in (9). Moreover, since the operator nature of the time t is a genuine fact in my framework of ideas, there is no obstacle to understand the usual energy-time uncertainty relation

$$\Delta E \Delta t \geq \hbar/2 \quad (18)$$

as an operator relation anymore, which has been absent in the conventional quantum mechanics,

$$[t, E] = i\hbar \quad (19)$$

that is consistent with the non-commutative space-times commutation relations (7) and (16).

Now, let me show that how this energy-time uncertainty relation insure that $\Delta x_i \geq l_{\text{Compton}}$ for any successive measurements in time Δt after the first measurement of one coordinate x_1 : From the energy-time uncertainty relation (18) and limit on Δt (17) one obtains $\Delta E = v \Delta p \sim mc^2$ such as $\Delta p \sim mc$, $v \sim c$, where $\Delta p, v$ are the momentum uncertainty, velocity of the particle after the first measurement in respectively; then, one finds that the struck particle will move $\Delta x_i \sim v \Delta t \geq l_{\text{Compton}}$ from the first observation point. Δx_1 is the same order of the first measurement and so it is a repeatable measurement. But the important point is that the other coordinate x_2 , which has not been measured in the first measurement but only considered a priori as the horizon size $\sim l_{\text{Schwarzschild}} (< l_{\text{Compton}})$ which would be a genuine size of the particle, can not be probed below l_{Compton} still in the successive measurements. This insures that l_{Compton} is a genuine bound on the space localization. But notice that in this measuring process, the minimum uncertainty state (8) is destroyed and a higher uncertainty state is observed in the second measurement, i.e., $\Delta x_1 \Delta x_2 \geq l_{\text{Compton}}^2/2 > l_{\text{Planck}}^2$.

Now, let me turn to the question on the Hawking radiation which might cause the elementary black hole to be unstable. It is well known that the large mass black hole has the Hawking radiation according to the semi-classical quantization which neglect the back reaction [15]. But, its validity is questionable for this microscopic black hole where the back reaction can not be neglected anymore. Moreover, the space outside the horizon is non-commutative space such as the usual physical laws might be broken down near the horizon⁶. On the other hand, similar

⁶With a naive use of the elementary particles' mass, charge, and interpretation of j as the spin $\sim \hbar$, horizon becomes *naked*. But, this might not be the case from this non-commutativity.

to the atomic physics, quantum mechanics would be also crucial to make the elementary black hole be stable against the radiation⁷ ; but complete understanding needs to be discovered⁸.

Large Black Hole: For large black hole whose horizon radius r_+ is bigger than the Planck length l_{Planck} one can probe its boundary ($l_{\text{Schwarzschild}} > l_{\text{Compton}}$) such as it can not be considered as an elementary particle anymore. Moreover, the non-commutative space have negligable relavance in the dynamics for center of black hole ($l_{\text{Schwarzschild}} > l_{\text{Planck}}$) but rather have dominant relavance in the surface dyanamics on the horizon ($l_{\text{Planck}} > l_{\text{Compton}}$). This may be understood as a holography of the bulk non-commutative spaces onto the horizon of the semi-classical black hole [16, 17, 18]. So, it would be more natural to consider the compactified noncommutative space for a treatment of the large black hole.

As the simplest space, let me consider a non-commutative sphere with three coordinates x_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$)

$$[x_i, x_j] = i \frac{\theta}{r} \epsilon_{ijk} x_k, \quad (20)$$

where r is the radius of the non-commutative sphere. Now then, let me identify this non-commutative sphere as the black hole horizon, then the discrete spectrum of the horizon area A is derived, with an identification of $x_i^2 = r^2$, within the non-commutative quantum mechanics [19]:

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \oint_{r=r_+} d^2x = 4\pi r^2 \\ &= 4\pi l_{\text{Planck}}^2 \sqrt{j(j+1)}, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where j is the heighest weight of an irreducible representation of $SU(2)$ spin algebra of $R_i = (r/\theta)x_i$.

On the other hand, this non-commutative sphere approach is exactly the same as what Bekenstein [20] has assumed in an algebraic formulation of the black hole quantization by identifying R_i and A with Bekenstein's angular momentum operator $\hat{\mathbf{J}}$ and area operator $\hat{A}$, in respectively. So, it will be an interesting problem to derive the uniformly spaced area spectrum, $A \sim l_{\text{Planck}}^2 n$ [21], which produces a more interesting interpretation on the black hole entropy, within my context also without assuming other more complicated algebraic works.

Finally, I note that, for the quantization of an elementary black hole system, study on the bulk non-commutative space is needed in contrast to large black hole. In this procedure, finding the black hole solutions on the non-commutative space will be a outstanding challenge which will be a first step toward the quantization [22].

⁷This has been recently argued also by Adler *et al.* [13] within the generalized uncertainty principle context.

⁸Probably, this elementary black hole will be relevant to the ground state of the macroscopic black holes [14].

Acknowledgment

I would like to thank Parameswaran Nair and Alexios Polychronakos for comments. This work was supported in part by a CUNY Collaborative Incentive Research Grant.

References

- [1] There are a huge number of papers on diverse aspects. For an overall view of this field see A. Connes, M. R. Douglas and A. Schwartz, JHEP 9802, 003 (1998); N. Seiberg and E. Witten, JHEP 9909, 032 (1999).
- [2] S. Girvin and T. Jach, Phys. Rev. **D29**, 5617 (1984); G. Dunne, R. Jackiw and C. Trugenberger, Phys. Rev. **D41**, 661 (1990).
- [3] L. Susskind, hep-th/0101029; A. P. Polychronakos, hep-th/0103013; D. Karabali and B. Sakita, hep-th/0106016.
- [4] M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, Phys. Lett. **B510**, 247 (2001); V. P. Nair and A. P. Polychronakos, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87** 030403 (2001); D. Bak, K. Lee and J.-H. Park, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 030402 (2001).
- [5] J. D. Bekenstein, Phys. Rev. **D7**, 2333 (1973).
- [6] G. 't Hooft, Class. Quant. Grav. **13**, 1023 (1996); Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A11**, 4623 (1996).
- [7] L. D. Landau and R. Peierls, Z. Phys. **69**, 56 (1931); V. B. Berestetskii, E. M. Lifschitz and L. P. Pitaevskii, *Quantum Electrodynamics* (Pergamon Press, New York, 1982); K. Gottfried, *Quantum Mechanics, Vol.I* (W. A. Benjamin Inc., New York, 1966).
- [8] M.-I. Park and Y.-J. Park, Nuov. Cim. **111B**, 1333 (1996).
- [9] H. S. Snyder, Phys. Rev. **71**, 38 (1947); M. Maggiore, Phys. Lett. **B319**, 83 (1993); S. de Haro, JHEP **10**, 023 (1998); N. Sasakura, JHEP **05**, 015 (2000).
- [10] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3370 (1999).
- [11] T. Yoneya, hep-th/0010172.
- [12] N. Seiberg, L. Susskind and N. Toumbas, hep-th/0005015.
- [13] R. J. Adler, P. Chen, and D. I. Santiago, gr-qc/0106080.

- [14] M.-I. Park, hep-th/0111224.
- [15] S. W. Hawking, Nature **248**, 30 (1974).
- [16] J. D. Bekenstein, Phys. Rev. **D49**, 1912 (1994).
- [17] G. 't Hooft, gr-qc/9310026.
- [18] L. Susskind, J. Math. Phys. **36**, 6377 (1995).
- [19] D. Karabali, V. P. Nair and A. P. Polychronakos, hep-th/0011249.
- [20] J. D. Bekenstein, hep-th/0107045.
- [21] J. D. Bekenstein, Lett. Nuovo. Cim. **11**, 467 (1974); V. Mukhanov, JETP Lett. **44**, 63 (1986); Y. I. Kogan, *ibid.*, **44**, 267 (1986); A. Alekseev, A. P. Polychronakos, and M. Smedbäck, hep-th/0004036.
- [22] M. Bañados, *et al.*, hep-th/0104264; V. P. Nair, hep-th/0112114.